

Appl. No. : 09/379,704
Filed : August 24, 1999

the shelf.” Furthermore, the front plate 41 of each track was sized to snugly fit forward of the inner flanges or lips 36. This snug fit prevented sliding along the front stop/connector unless desired by the person assembling or mounting the track system. Thus, Hawkinson did not teach free sliding either. Because neither reference taught or suggested at least this limitation, Claim 7 is patentable over the applied combination.

Claims 8-14, 20-22, 26, and 29-32 are patentable for at least the same reasons as Claim 7. In addition, at least some of these claims recite further patentable distinctions. For instance, Claim 20 recites that the product tracks comprise clips that are slidable in the races. In addition, Claim 21 recites, among other limitations, that the product track comprises a pair of raised rails each having a generally T-shape, and that the pusher block includes at least two sets of opposing flanges, wherein each said set of opposing flanges captures an outside edge and an inside edge of a corresponding one of said rails. For at least these reasons, Claims 8-14, 20-22, 26, and 29-32 also are not *prima facie* obvious and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

With respect to Claim 36, this claim also is allowable due to the sliding limitations, for instance. Accordingly, reconsideration of Claim 36 is respectfully requested.

THE REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 3, 16-19, 23, 24, 27, 28 AND 30-32 ARE DEFICIENT

A number of dependent claims, which ultimately depend from Claims 1 and 7, have been rejected in other view of other combinations that are based upon the above-discussed combination. As the additional references cited do not correct the above-noted deficiencies with respect to the base claims, adding the reference to the rejection for the indicated reasons does not supply the missing elements needed for the base rejection. Accordingly, each of these rejections is similarly deficient and further discussion is unnecessary.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims and specification. Accordingly, issuance of a Notice of Allowance is most earnestly solicited.

Appl. No. : 09/379,704
Filed : August 24, 1999

The undersigned has made a good faith effort to respond to all of the rejections in the case and to place the claims in condition for immediate allowance. Nevertheless, if any undeveloped issues remain or if any issues require clarification, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicant's attorney, Robert J. Roby at (949) 721-6359 (direct line) in order to resolve such issue promptly.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: February 5, 2001

By: 

Robert J. Roby
Registration No. 44,304
Attorney of Record
620 Newport Center Drive
Sixteenth Floor
Newport Beach, CA 92660
(949) 760-0404

H:\DOCS\RJR\RJR-3464.DOC
020201